



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,114	12/11/2001	Vij Rajarajan	MS167414.2/40062.150USU1	3950

27488 7590 09/17/2004

MICROSOFT CORPORATION  
C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.  
P.O. BOX 2903  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 09/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/014,114

Applicant(s)

RAJARAJAN ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh B Thai

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed May 10, 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2171

This is in response to the amendment filed May 10, 200 in which amended claims 1-13 and new claims 14-20 are presented for examination.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, it is not clear how an object maintained by a first resource (software) is represented by a property sheet that includes property pages from the first resource (software) and property pages from second resource (hardware).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they represent mere arrangement of data, do not define a functional interrelationship among that data and the computing process performed when reutilizing that data and as such do not implement a statutory process.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2171

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duxbury (US 6,684,227) in view of Lee (US 6,732,362).

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Duxbury discloses in a distributed network environment having a server computer system and a plurality of managed resources, each resource maintaining a plurality of objects (see Fig. 1 and corresponding text, Duxbury), a method of representing at least one of the objects comprising:

- receiving a first schema document that conforms to a property sheet definition such that the first schema document defines a property sheet (see col.2, lns. 33, 64, Duxbury);
- receiving a two or more second schema documents that conform to a page definition to define a plurality of pages (see col. 8, lns. 40-67, Duxbury), wherein at least one page originates from a resource (see col. 6, lns. 40-51, Duxbury). “Tabs” The details of the content sheet for the selected object corresponds to the property page;
- modifying the property sheet to include the received pages; and wherein the property sheet represents the object (see col. 7, lns. 1-5, Duxbury).

Duxbury, however, does not explicitly disclose software resource and hardware resource.

Lee, on the other hand, discloses the “base class” and “Scope” that is equivalent to the Software resource, the “Resource Installation Request Message” that is equivalent to the Property Page From New Resource (Hardware resource). Please note, the request message

Art Unit: 2171

reads on a property page because it contains information about the hardware resource to be installed; at the very least it holds identification information). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Duxbury as taught by Lee to include the claim feature because it would provides an efficient and convenient mechanism for managing versions of the document content (see col.1, lns. 65-67, Duxbury).

Regarding claims 2 and 8, Duxbury/Lee combination further discloses that the property sheet comprises object-type information applicable to objects of the same type, and wherein the property pages comprise resource-specific information (see col.8, lns. 35-56, Duxbury).

Regarding claims 3 and 9, Duxbury/Lee combination further discloses receiving a request to display information related to an instance of an object (see col.2, lines 33, 64, Duxbury); accessing the property sheet related to the object-type of the instance of the object; displaying object-type information gleaned from the property sheet; using the property pages of the property sheet, displaying information related to resources associated with the instance of the object; requesting the resources associated with the instance of the object to supply instance-specific information; and displaying received instance-specific information from the associated resources (see col. 7, lns. 66 to col. 8, lns. 67, Duxbury).

Regarding claim 4, Duxbury/Lee combination further discloses at least one property page includes a pointer to executable code on its associated resource for resolving a request for instance specific information (see col. 8, lns. 12-20, Duxbury).

Regarding claim 5, Duxbury/Lee combination further discloses the code relates to a search engine on the associated resource (see col. 6, lns. 40-45, Duxbury).

Regarding claims 6 and 10, A method as defined in claim 1 wherein the predetermined definitions for the property sheet and property pages are XML document type definitions (see col. 6, lns 48-51, Duxbury).

Regarding claim 11, Duxbury discloses in a network environment having multiple resources, a computer program product readable by a computer and having stored thereon a data structure (see Fig. 1 and corresponding text, Duxbury), comprising:

- a property sheet representing the object maintained by one of the multiple resources (see col.2, lns. 33, 64, and col. 8, lns.40-44, Duxbury);
- property page are stored in association with the property sheet (col. 8, lns.40-44; col. 9, lns. 7-10 and lns. 29-35, Duxbury).

Duxbury, however, does not explicitly disclose the property pages associated with software and hardware resources. Lee, on the other hand, on the other hand, discloses the “base class” and “Scope” that is equivalent to the Software resource, the “Resource Installation Request Message” that is equivalent to the Property Page From New Resource (Hardware resource). Please note, the request message reads on a property page because it contains information about the hardware resource to be installed; at the very least it holds identification information). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 2171

invention to modify Duxbury as taught by Lee to include the claim feature because it would provides an efficient and convenient mechanism for managing versions of the document content (see col.1, lines 65-67, Duxbury).

Regarding claim 12, A computer program product as defined in claim 11 wherein the property sheet relates to object type information and wherein the property pages relate to resource-specific information (see col.8, lines 35-56, Duxbury).

Regarding claim 13, A computer program product as defined in claim 12 wherein at least one property page includes a pointer to executable code on its associated resource for resolving a request for instance specific information (see col. 8, lines 12-20, Duxbury).

2. Claims 14-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 6,732,362) in view of W3C "Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0."

Regarding claims 14 and 20, Lee discloses in a distributed network environment having a server computer system and a plurality of managed resources including a first resource having a first object, a method of installing a new resource on the distributed network comprising:

- Storing a property sheet representing the first object (see col. 3, lns. 28-40 - note the base class contains properties in the form of object attributes, and thus reads on a property sheet). The "base class" and "Scope" corresponds to the Property Sheet (Software), the "Resource Installation Request Message" corresponds to the Property Page From New

Art Unit: 2171

Resource (Hardware Property Sheet). Please note, the request message reads on a property page because it contains information about the hardware resource to be installed; at the very least it holds identification information).

- Receiving a request from the new resource to be installed on the distributed network (see col 3, lns. 8-12, Lee).
- Generate and Store Object Instance corresponds to "Storing the Property Page with the Property Sheet" (see col. 3, lns. 42-51, Lee).

Lee, however, does not disclose the property pages stored as XML.

W3C discloses the storage of metadata in the form of XML (Section 1, "Introduction" and Section 1.1 "Origin and Goals").

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to apply XML to the property sheets in Lee. The motivation to combine is suggested by W3C which discloses that use of XML to metadata such as that in the property sheets of Lee provide many advantages including the ability to use ubiquitous Internet protocols, ease of use, and brevity (Section 1.1 "Origin and Goals").

Regarding claim 15, Lee/W3C combination further discloses that the property sheet is stored on the first resource and from which the user can manage the new resource's relationship with the first object (see col. 3, lns. 28-51, Lee).

Regarding claim 16, Lee/W3C combination further discloses the property sheet includes at least one first property page provided by a managed hardware resource and at least one first



Art Unit: 2171

property page provided by a managed software resource (see col. 3, lns. 28-40 - note the base class contains properties in the form of object attributes, and thus reads on a property sheet). Lee discloses the “base class” and “Scope” corresponds to the Property Sheet (Software). Lee further discloses the “Resource Installation Request Message” corresponds to the Property Page From New Resource (Hardware Property Sheet). Please note, the request message reads on a property page because it contains information about the hardware resource to be installed; at the very least it holds identification information).

Regarding claim 17, Wilson/Lee combination further discloses that the property sheet comprises object-type information and the property pages comprise resource-specific information (see col. 3, lns. 28-40, Lee).

3. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 6,732,362) in view of W3C “Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0.” and further view of Wilson (US 6,002,389).

Regarding claim 18, Lee/W3C combination does not disclose the displaying information related to the first object;... and displaying new resource information.

Wilson, however, discloses GUI systems that display the information of the combination system of Lee and W3C (see col.3, ln. 47 to col. 4, ln.45; Abstract and Summary of Wilson).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to apply the user interface of Wilson to the Lee and W3C combination. The motivation to combine is suggested

Art Unit: 2171

by Wilson which discloses a particularly advantageous way of displaying property data such as that of the property sheets in XML of Lee and W3C combination (Wilson: col. 1 ln. 63 to col. 2, ln. 8).

Regarding claim 19, Lee/W3C/Wilson combination further discloses accessing the pointer when the method allows clicking on a tab or menu in Wilson, which reads on accessing a pointer which points to code to get data about a resource.

### *Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2171

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883 and 571-272-4029 after October 18, 2004. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh Thai   
Art Unit 2171  
September 9, 2004

  
**UYEN LE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**